## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-12 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for claiming non-statutory subject matter. The independent claims (1, 7 and 12), which recite

5    the limitations "inspector," "inspector library" and "special purpose executable code," are amended herein to specify that these limitations execute on the consumer's computer, thereby tangibly limiting them to a physical instantiation. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. It is Applicant's position that the language "computer implemented" in each independent claim is

10   legally sufficient to render the subject matter patentable. However, in the interest of moving the prosecution forward, Applicant amends the claims as described above.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-12 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

15   anticipated by Ahmad. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As amended, claim 1 recites "said inspector automatically and without receiving consumer input querying at least one physical device communicatively coupled to said consumer's computer, in order to glean property information concerning said consumer's computer." In other words, the inspector runs on the

20   consumer's computer and queries physical devices coupled thereto (e.g., the memory, the central processing unit, the network interface, connected computers) in order to learn information about the properties of the user's computer. All of this is done automatically, without any direction or input from the user.

25

Ahmad does not disclose or suggest these limitations. Instead, Ahmad discusses a system which attempts to trouble shoot a user's software problems, either by receiving input from the user as to the nature of the problem, or by interfacing with the problematic software program directly. Although this might

30   be helpful for suggesting software fixes to the user, nothing in Ahmad discloses

or suggests automatically glenaing hardware information about a consumer's computer, as recited by claim 1.

Claim 5 and claims 21-28 depend from claim 1, and thus should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 7 and 12 are system claims similar in scope to claim 1, and are amended herein to recite limitations similar to those discussed above. Therefore, claims 7 and 12 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 9-11 depend from claim 7, and thus should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 7. Claims 20 is cancelled without prejudice.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney Jeffrey Brill at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Brill
Reg. No. 51,198

Customer No. 22,862

9